

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program*

### *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011*

---

<b>Applicant</b>	Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$756,949
------------------	--	-------------------------	-----------

<b>Proposal Title</b>	Lower Mission Creek Flood Control and Restoration Project – Reach 2A	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$1,519,338
-----------------------	--	----------------------------	-------------

---

### PROPOSAL SUMMARY

This Project will construct an extension of the existing box culvert that was constructed under the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) in 2009 to the existing Mission Creek open channel downstream of Yanonali Street. The box culvert will be constructed in Reach 2A, upstream of Yanonali Street and tie-in to the existing box culvert under the UPRR. This box culvert along with the existing culvert and a future culvert to be constructed upstream will complete an overflow bypass culvert to improve flood flow conveyance. This Project is intended to improve flood flow conveyance, reduce erosion, and improve water quality. This Project is part of the overall 1.3-mile Lower Mission Creek Flood Control & Restoration Project.

### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	6/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	3/12
Budget	2/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	3/12
Schedule	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	1/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			24

### EVALUATION SUMMARY

#### Work Plan

The Work Plan criterion is marginally addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The identified tasks are commensurate with delivering the Project; however, there is not enough detail on how the Project will be implemented and achieve project goals. Similar to the Work Plans for Reaches 1A and 2B, subtask 9.2 Project Construction only discusses the duration of construction and labor compliance and does not discuss construction activities. There are also no monitoring tasks identified in the Work Plan. There is no demonstration that the Project is a stand-alone project that can function without improvements to other reaches of Lower Mission Creek.

## **Budget**

The Budget has some detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all the costs appear reasonable. Supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories described in Exhibit B. There is no explanation or documentation of how the project costs are estimated. The Budget categories do not agree with the tasks identified in the Work Plan or Schedule (i.e., different task names/headings are used in each attachment). No costs are included for Design and Engineering even though the Work Plan states the project is at a 60% design level; therefore, some costs would be expected to develop the 100% design package.

## **Schedule**

The Schedule is not entirely reasonable and not consistent with the Work Plan and Budget. The tasks shown on the Schedule do not match those in the Work Plan or Budget. The level of detail provided in the Schedule is insufficient. For example, the Schedule should include a list of major Construction subtasks with their estimated timeline. The Schedule should include a timeline for submission of quarterly and final reports. The construction award is scheduled for March 14, 2012, 5- 1/2 months after the anticipated grant award date (October 1, 2011). This Schedule seems to be questionable based on the reasonableness of the Schedule.

## **Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures**

The Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The application does not include the required Project Performance Measures Table. It is stated in the Work Plan that each reach of the overall Lower Mission Creek project will be constructed as a stand-alone project, but this section states that no monitoring, assessment or performance evaluation of Reach 2A will be done until the entire bypass box culvert is constructed (Reach2A and Reach 2B, Phase 2). No outcome indicators to evaluate change resulting from the construction of this component are included. The goals and the basis for expected habitat and/or water quality outcomes are not documented, and no project metrics are provided.

## **Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits**

Low levels of FDR Benefits can be realized through this Proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. An unreasonable process is used to determine project benefits. The Applicant assigns a percentage of the benefits available from the larger Lower Mission Creek project to this reach of the project without a clear rationale. The Applicant should calculate the expected annual damages that would occur from implementing the portion of the project Prop 1E funds are being requested for. The damages for with and without project conditions are not supported by any inundation maps, depths of flooding, or quantification of the inundated structures. The analysis includes several other errors. For example, the Applicant uses a 6% escalation rate to inflate project costs, this is not acceptable. The Applicant also uses the wrong updating factors to determine project cost and event damage. It is possible that some FDR Benefits are available from this project, but it is not possible to determine their magnitude from the information submitted in the application. No Water Supply Benefits are claimed.

## **Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits**

Low levels of Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. There is only a brief qualitative discussion of Water Quality or other Expected Benefits. No quantitative analysis is presented. Other expected benefits include environmental enhancement and aesthetic benefits.

### **Program Preferences**

The Proposal includes a project that implements multiple Program Preferences including: Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality, Expand Environmental Stewardship, and Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.